

Intelligent Systems Research and Development Support – 2 (ISRDS-2)
Additional Industry Questions and Answers

1. **Reference:** L.9 (a) A.1 Organizational Structure/Partnering Approach – Oral Presentation (Bullet 7 - managing new technology, licensing, and technology transfer)

Question: Are these processes specific to supporting the technology management of government (Code TI ISRDS) developed technologies/products and their subsequent transfer or license into the private sector or other government agencies? Or is it the company's processes that are to be described?

Answer: This refers to the company's processes.

2. **Reference:** L.8 (a) Instructions for Mission Suitability Oral Presentation

Question: Will the use of a Logitech wireless pointer during the oral presentation be allowed?

Answer: Yes, a wireless pointer can be used during the oral presentation.

3. **Reference:** Statement of Work Page 3

Question: Request a listing of the 11 laboratories be provided and identification of which Technical Area they support. A brief technical description of each lab would also be helpful. Perhaps a virtual tour of the labs would be good as well.

Answer: The laboratories support the technical areas and can change as requirements change, including being re-purposed as needed for another area. More detailed information regarding the laboratories will be provided on an "as needed" basis.

4. **Reference:** J.1(b) Attachment 6: Past Performance Questionnaire; L.9 (b) B. Reference Information

Question: The response to question #45 puts the burden on the offeror's customer to understand the scope of work of ISRDS-2 and make a comparison to the cited contract work. In some cases only the Contracting Officer completes the questionnaire and they would not be able to make a comparison of specific technical performance information from their contract to ISRDS-2. This would appear to give an unfair advantage to the incumbent if they use ISRDS as one of their past performance citations. Section L states "The goal of this factor is to obtain information regarding the Offeror and major subcontractor's relevant past performance specifically in the areas of technical performance, contract management, and corporate management responsiveness." Section M reference "This factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each Offeror's record of performing services or delivering products similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition." These areas stress "technical performance" on the contract. Request you consider not revising the questionnaire.

Answer: Only one modification will be made to the Past Performance Questionnaire. A "Contract Description" field will be added to Section B. Contractual Information within the Past Performance Questionnaire. The past performance reference will not be asked to make a SOW comparison between its contract and ISRDS-2. The Government will determine relevance based on the information provided by the Offeror and its references as outlined in the RFP.

5. In its response to industry questions on the ISRDS-2 Draft RFP (NNA13424845R, DRFP Questions and Answers, April 10, 2013), NASA Ames was very clear in its definition of Major Subcontractor for the purposes of Past Performance versus Cost (equal to, or greater than a contract value of \$20M over 5 years for Past Performance and, equal to or greater than a contract value \$2M over 5 years to meet the requirement for a subcontractor to provide cost information).

The draft RFP section L.9 (b)(1) requires:

"A list of not more than three (3) relevant contracts (including government and industry contracts), each in excess of \$5M, completed no more than five (5) years ago or ongoing, involving related types of effort. These contracts shall demonstrate the Offeror's capabilities to perform this requirement."

Question: We would like to confirm that a major subcontractor for the ISRDS-2 contract, as defined to meet the requirement to submit Past Performance references shall be for those subcontractors which will perform equal to or greater than \$20M Total Contract Value over 5 years on the ISRDS-2 contract. Additionally, we would like to confirm that to be evaluated by NASA Ames as qualified past performance references, contracts sited as Past Performance must have a Total Contract Value equal to or greater than \$5M over 5 years.

Answer: Section L.9(b) will read as follows:

For purposes of this solicitation, "major subcontractors" is defined as subcontracting dollars of \$5,000,000 or more covering a performance period of five (5) years. "Offeror" and "major subcontractor," for purposes of this solicitation include predecessor companies.

As a minimum, the Past Performance Proposal shall include the following:

- (1) A list of three (3) relevant contracts (including government and industry contracts), each in excess of \$20,000,000 total contract value for the prime and each in excess of \$5,000,000 total contract value for the major subcontractor, completed no more than five (5) years ago or on-going, involving related types of effort.

6. **Reference:** Government Response to Questions dated 10 April 2013, Question 45.

Question: The Government's response is to modify the questionnaire to gather technical relevance information. It is our opinion that the nine questions are consistent with the information that the Government requests in Section L.9.(b) and are already related to the Scope of Work, which includes Introduction (1.0), Core Support Function (2.1), Core Technology Research Areas (2.2), IDIQ areas (2.3), Quality Assurance (3.0), Deliverables (4.0), and Phase-in/phase-out (5.0). To get down to the level lower than x.x, it will take many more pages to prepare the past performance, generating additional burden for the Government to review and the contractors to prepare the material. We request the Government not to revise the questionnaire.

Answer: Only one modification will be made to the Past Performance Questionnaire. A "Contract Description" field has been added to Section B. Contractual Information within the Past Performance Questionnaire.

7. **Reference:** Government Response to Questions dated 10 April 2013, Questions 101 and 103.

Question: The Government's response to revise the definition of "Major Subcontractor" from \$5M over five years to \$20M over five years, seems unfair to small business subcontractors who may provide niche research, mission and IT support services that are critical and directly related to Code TI Research Areas, yet smaller in magnitude than the limits proposed. For this round of competition, the utilization of small businesses is increased to 34%. It is very likely that none of the small business subcontractors meet the \$20M work share. Would the Government consider not revising this definition in the final RFP and leave the definition at \$5M? We noticed that in the last round of competition, \$5M was used.

Answer: Section L.9(b) will read as follows:

For purposes of this solicitation, "major subcontractors" is defined as subcontracting dollars of \$5,000,000 or more covering a performance period of five (5) years. "Offeror" and "major subcontractor," for purposes of this solicitation includes predecessor companies.

As a minimum, the Past Performance Proposal shall include the following:

(1) A list of three (3) relevant contracts (including government and industry contracts), each in excess of \$20,000,000 total contract value for the prime and each in excess of \$5,000,000 total contract value for the major subcontractor, completed no more than five (5) years ago or on-going, involving related types of effort.

8. **Reference:** Government Response to Questions dated 10 April 2013, Questions 102, 105, 106, 108, and 109.

Question: Given that the Government has modified the requirement for past performance references to include 3 from the prime and 3 for each major subcontract, will the Government consider revising the page count restrictions to a per reference limit of 5 pages versus a total limit for the Past Performance Volume, including 2 pages for the introduction?

Answer: At this time, the Government will not revise the page count total for the Past Performance Volume.